

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,915	07/10/2003	Jerome James Workman JR.	MLA.026CP	4223
20995 KNORRE MA	7590 09/17/200' RTENS OLSON & BE.	EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN STREET			SCHUBERG, LAURA J	
FOURTEENT: IRVINE, CA 9			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1657	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2007	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/617,915	WORKMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Laura Schuberg	1657		

•	Laura Schuberg	1657					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because							
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or	· .						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Applicant has amended claims 19 and 33 to include additional limitations and added new claims that require further search and consideration (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 19 and 23-43.		ill be entered and an o	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected. <u>19 and 25-45.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	st bestern an en the data of filling a b	lation of Ammonl will m					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
		Lean B Lankford,	Jr.				
		Primary Examiner					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims remain rejected under 103(a) over Chick et al. (US 6,040,194) in view of Cote et al. (US 6,485,703). Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in trying to combine the teachings of Cote with that of Chick to obtain the presently claimed invention. Applicant asserts that Chick does not provide any teaching as to how one might alter the fluorescent reagents or substitute them with other fluorescent reagents so as to allow the reagent to have a size and chemistry that would allow it to diffuse across the cellular membrane of a skin cell to allow monitoring. This is not found persuasive because, as Applicant states on page 18 line 28 of the specification, "it is well known that specific dyes bind to cellular structures and allow imaging and anatomical/histological studies of intracellular structures". In addition Chick specifically teaches that a variety of modes of placing the reagents in communication with the analytes may be used (column 16 line 37).